1	SHANNON G. SPLAINE, ESQ.			
2	Nevada Bar No. 8241 LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON & CERCOS, LLP			
3	3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 200   Las Vegas, Nevada 89169			
4	Telephone: 702.257.1997   Facsimile: 702.257.2203			
5	ssplaine@lgclawoffice.com			
6	Attorneys for Defendants, National Collegiate Trust 2007-1 and			
7	NCO Financial Systems, Inc.			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
10				
11	SUSAN SHELD and ELLEN SHELD	Case No.: 2:15-cv-1140		
12	Plaintiffs, vs.	DEFENDANT NATIONAL		
13	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., a	COLLEGIATE STUDENT LOAN TRUST 2007-1'S ANSWER TO		
14	Pennsylvania corporation, PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C. a California corporation,	COMPLAINT AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES		
15	NATIONAL COLLEGIATE STUDENT LOAN TRUST 2007-1, a foreign entity, DOES I-V	DEFERGES		
16	inclusive, and ROE Corporations VI-X inclusive			
17	Defendants.			
18	Defendant National Collegiate Student I	on Trust 2007 1 (hominoften NGCLT) has and		
l	Defendant, National Collegiate Student Loan Trust 2007-1 (hereinafter NCSLT), by and			
19	through undersigned counsel, responds to the Complaint filed by plaintiffs, Susan and Ellen Sheld, a			
20	follows:			
21	PRELIMINARY STATEMENT			
22	1. NCSLT admits plaintiffs purport to assert claims under the Fair Debt Collection			
23	Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. and Nevada law, but denies any wrongdoing			
24	liability, or violations of law to the extent alleged in ¶ 1.			
25	2. The allegations in ¶ 2 are not directed towards NCSLT and do not require an affirmative			
26	response, but to the extent a response is required, NCSLT denies any wrongdoing, liability, o			
27	violations of law to the extent alleged in ¶ 2.			
28	///			

1

### 2

## 3

# 45

### 6

7

# 8

### 10

#### 11

#### 12

#### 13

## 14

# 15

#### 16

### 17

#### 18 19

## 20

#### 21

# 2223

#### 24

### 25

# 2627

## 28

///

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. NCSLT admits the allegations in ¶ 3 for jurisdictional and venue purposes only.

#### **PARTIES**

- 4. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 4 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein.
- 5. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 5 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein.
- 6. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 6 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.
- 7. NCSLT admits that it had a servicing relationship with NCO Financial Systems, Inc., to assist in the collection of NCSLT accounts. Except as specifically admitted, NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 7 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.
- 8. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 8 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.
  - 9. NCSLT admits the allegations in  $\P$  9.
- 10. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 10 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein.
- 11. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 11 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.
- 12. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 12 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein.
- 13. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 13 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.
- 14. NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 14 for lack of sufficient information to justify a reasonable belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.
  - 15. NCSLT denies the allegations in  $\P$  15.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS** 

17. 18. 19. 20.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 17.  NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 18 as calling for a legal conclusion.  NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 19.  NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 20.	
19. 20.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 19.	
20.		
	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 20	
21	resp. defines the anegations in    20.	
	NCSLT admits that it purchased the plaintiffs' account from Bank of America and the	
account was serviced by NCO. Except as specifically admitted, NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶		
21.		
22.	NCSLT admits the allegations in ¶ 22 upon information and belief.	
23.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 23 for lack of sufficient information to justify a	
reasonable belief therein.		
24.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 24 for lack of sufficient information to justify a	
reasonable belief therein.		
25.	NCSLT admits the allegations in ¶ 25 upon information and belief.	
26.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 26 as calling for a legal conclusion.	
27.	NCSLT denies the allegations in $\P$ 27 for lack of sufficient information to justify a	
reasonable belief therein.		
28.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 28.	
29.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 29.	
	FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF	
30.	NCSLT reasserts the foregoing as if fully incorporated herein.	
31.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 31.	
32.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 32.	
33.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 33.	
31.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 31.	
	SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF	
34. NCSLT reasserts the foregoing as if fully incorporated herein.		
	-3-	
	21. account was 21. 22. 23. reasonable be 24. reasonable be 25. 26. 27. reasonable be 28. 29.  30. 31. 32. 33. 31.	

1	35.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 35.	
2	36.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 36 as calling for a legal conclusion.	
3	37.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 37.	
4	38.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 38.	
5		THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF	
6	39.	NCSLT reasserts the foregoing as if fully incorporated herein.	
7	40.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 40 as calling for a legal conclusion.	
8	41.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 41.	
9	42.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 42.	
10	43.	NCSLT denies the allegations in ¶ 43.	
11		<b>DEMAND FOR RELIEF</b>	
12	44.	NCSLT denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought.	
13		AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES	
14		FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
15	As a first affirmative defense, Defendant alleges Plaintiffs' Complaint should be dismisse		
16	because it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.		
17		SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
18	As a second affirmative defense, Defendant alleges Plaintiffs knowingly and voluntaril		
19	released and/or waived his right to obtain any or all of the relief sought in the complaint.		
20	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
21	As a third affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that assuming Plaintiffs have suffered an		
22	injury as the result of conduct by Defendants, which is expressly denied, Plaintiffs have failed t		
23	mitigate her damages, and to the extent of such failure to mitigate, damages awarded to Plaintiffs,		
24	any, should be reduced accordingly.		
25	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
26	As a fourth affirmative defense, Defendants allege Plaintiffs' claims may be barred in whol		
27	or in part by the doctrines of estoppel and/or laches.		
28	///		

1 FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE As a fifth affirmative defense, Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the 2 litigation privilege. 3 4 **SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** As a sixth affirmative defense, any harm suffered by Plaintiffs was legally and proximately 5 caused by persons, individuals, corporations, or entities beyond the control or supervision of NCSLT, 6 7 or for whom NCSLT is not responsible or liable. 8 SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE As a seventh affirmative defense, Defendant alleges it currently has insufficient information 9 as to whether it has additional affirmative defenses available. Defendant reserves the right to assert 10 11 additional affirmative defenses in the event investigation and discovery indicate such defenses would be appropriate. 12 WHEREFORE, NCSLT respectfully requests that: 13 1. Plaintiffs take nothing by way of their Complaint; 14 15 2. Judgment of dismissal be entered in favor of NCSLT; 3. NCSLT be awarded costs and attorney's fees it has incurred in defending this lawsuit; 16 and 17 4. 18 NCSLT be granted such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2015. 19 20 LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON & CERCOS, LLP 21 22 SHANNON G. SPLAINE, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 8241 23 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 200 24 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5968 Attorneys for Defendants, 25 National Collegiate Trust 2007-1 and NCO Financial Systems, Inc. 26 27 28

PROOF OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE I hereby certify that on this 19<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2015, I caused a true copy of **DEFENDANT** NATIONAL COLLEGIATE STUDENT LOAN TRUST 2007-1'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES to be e-filed and e-served through the Official Court Electronic Filing System – CM/ECF to all other counsel of record as follows: Craig B. Friedberg, Esq. Law Offices of Craig B. Friedberg 4760 South Pecos Road, Suite 103 Las Vegas, NV 89121 Westley Villanueva Patenaude & Felix, APC 7271 W. Charleston Blvd, Suite 100 Las Vegas, NV 89117 Staci D. Ibarra, an employee of THE LAW OFFICES OF LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON & CERCOS, LLP